Agenda Item No.: 19.

# AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: DECEMBER 6, 2007

<b>DEPARTMENT: PLANNING &amp; DEVEI</b>	OPMENT
<b>DIRECTOR:</b> M. MARGO WHEELE	CR ☐ Consent ☐ Discussion
SUBJECT:	
TABLED - RENOTIFICATION - GPA-22587 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT -	
PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: 1	NOELLE SORELL - OWNER: CHURCH ST.
<b>THOMAS CATHOLIC CHURCH</b> - Request to Amend a portion of the Southwest Sector Plan	
of the General Plan FROM: R(RURAL DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) TO: ML (MEDIUM LOW	
DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) on 2.49 acres at the southeast corner of Roberta Lane and Apricot	
Lane (APN 138-13-801-002), Ward 5 (Barlow). NOTE: THIS APPLICATION HAS BEEN	
AMENDED TO THE L (LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION	
CC: 01/09/08	
PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:	<b>APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:</b>
Planning Commission Mtg. 11	Planning Commission Mtg. 7
City Council Meeting 0	City Council Meeting 0
RECOMMENDATION: DENIAL	

### **BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

- 1. Location and Aerial Maps
- 2. Conditions (Not Applicable) and Staff Report
- 3. Supporting Documentation
- 4. Photos
- 5. Justification Letter
- 6. Protest Postcards
- 7. Submitted after final agenda Support postcards for Items 19 and 20
- 8. Submitted at meeting Support petition and site measurements by Noelle Sorell

Motion made by STEVEN EVANS to Hold In Abeyance to 1/10/2008 Items 19-22

Passed For: 6; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 1 LEO DAVENPORT, GLENN TROWBRIDGE, DAVID STEINMAN, BYRON GOYNES, RICHARD TRUESDELL, STEVEN EVANS; (Against-None); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-SAM DUNNAM)

#### Minutes:

CHAIRMAN DAVENPORT declared the Public Hearing open for Items 19-22.

## City of Las Vegas Agenda Item No.: 19.

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: DECEMBER 6, 2007

ANDY REED, Planning and Development Department, stated that the proposal is not compatible with the properties to the south and to the east and recommended denial.

NOELLE SORELL, 8227 Rotado Road, appeared on behalf of the applicant. She explained that the proposal is to build a low-density development of eleven two-story homes to be situated on a 2.49-acre parcel. She displayed site plans for each of the lots indicating the large lots and adequate parking. MS. SORELL disclosed that at the neighborhood meeting with Smoke Ranch Villa residents, the applicant revealed that the development would be comprised of single-story dwellings. As a result of a subsequent marketing analysis, the applicant reversed his decision, feeling it would be more advantageous to build two-story homes instead. MS. SORELL, submitted a list of signatures in support of the two-story project.

EILEEN McKYTON, 9033 Big Plantation Avenue, appeared in support of the proposed development. She commented on previous approvals for developments that were incompatible with the surrounding area. She felt the project will have little impact on the neighborhood, it qualified as a hardship and stated that the variances should be allowed.

ALEX McKYTON, 9033 Big Plantation Avenue, appeared in support of the application. He referenced various Residential Planned Developments and felt this development would be very compatible with the surrounding area.

JUDITH COON, 2400 Apricot Lane, spoke on behalf of her neighbors and expressed their support of the proposed development. MS.COON noted that presently people dump their trash in the vacant area, so having a development would be a welcome change. She asked the Commission to approve the applications.

COMMISSIONER TROWBRIDGE noted that the staff report made reference to the project as meeting Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design standards. MS. SORELL replied that the project would be green homes and the applicant plans to work with a group called Green Houses. DOUG RANKIN, Planning and Development Department, in response to COMMISSIONER TROWBRIDGE'S query, stated that the development is not within the Interlocal Agreement area, therefore, it would not impact County and City border projects

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL asked about the City's position in regards to holding developers accountable once a project is approved. MR. RANKIN replied that staff is currently working on a sustainability audit program to be included in the Development Code. COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL further expressed that although the neighbors support and encourage the building of this project, all of the properties on three sides of the proposed development are zoned R-E. He felt it would set a standard for future requests.

MS. SORELL explained that the number of streets as well as the size of those streets were mandated by the Planning Department. She informed that eleven homes is the minimum that can be developed on that parcel.

City of Las Vegas Agenda Item No.: 19.

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: DECEMBER 6, 2007

COMMISSIONER EVANS observed that the illustration shows a garage that could accommodate an RV and commented that it did not appear to be aesthetically pleasing. He referenced a number of notices of opposition that were received. COMMISSIONER EVANS took exception to the applicant's requests as he felt that the end result would be economic profit and financial success for the developer and no benefit to the City.

COMMISSIONER STEINMAN questioned whether the development would be a Homeowners Association. MS. SORRELL replied it would not.

DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY JAMES LEWIS clarified that a Homeowners' Association must be established as stipulated in Condition 21 of Item 22.

With regard to solar panels, COMMISSIONER STEINMAN suggested they be installed facing the interior of the development as the applicant was uncertain of what type of solar panel materials would be used and to alleviate any visual impact to the adjacent neighbors. COMMISSIONER STEINMAN inquired as to whether the applicant was required to complete full or half street improvements. BART ANDERSON, Public Works Department, explained that Condition 15 of the Site Development Plan Review addresses that requirement.

GREG NEAL appeared on behalf of the applicant and attempted to focus on the positive aspects of the proposed development compared to a previously approved development across the street. COMMISSIONER EVANS interjected and stated that each application is considered based on its merits and this project did not meet the high standards by which the Commission bases its support.

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL reiterated the same concerns previously made. He remarked that approval of this project could possibly result in future requests for additional changes. He also pointed out that he could not guarantee that he would support the GPA when it once again comes before the Commission.

COMMISSIONERS TROWBRIDGE and EVANS asked the applicant to work closely with staff to meet the LEED Standards for homes. MS. SORELL agreed.

CHAIRMAN DAVENPORT declared the Public Hearing closed for Items 19-22.